



**California Energy Commission
Joint IEPR/Siting Committee Workshop**

**Transmission Planning Process/Strategies Refinement and
Corridor Information Development**

June 15, 2009 – 9:00 a.m.

AGENDA

9:00 Introduction

Suzanne Korosec, IEPR Lead

9:05 Opening Comments

Commissioner Jeffrey Byron

Vice Chair James Boyd

Chairman Karen Douglas

9:15 Overview and Goals for Today's Workshop

Judy Grau, Strategic Transmission Planning Office

9:20 Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI) Phase 2A Results

Dave Olsen, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies

**10:40 Panel Discussion: Achieving a Coordinated Statewide Transmission
Planning Process** (Moderator: Chuck Najarian)

Background: Based on stakeholder input received at the May 4 workshop, staff has prepared a strawman process diagram (see Agenda Attachment, Figure 1) that shows how the RETI collaborative process with its integration of land use and electrical planning can be leveraged to achieve a coordinated statewide transmission process that meets the goal of 33 percent renewables by 2020. Staff has also prepared a strawman proposal for the development of a longer-term transmission plan for California beyond the RETI time horizon (see Agenda Attachment, Figure 2).

General question for all panelists:

What is your overall reaction to these strawman coordinated transmission planning processes?

Specific questions for selected panelists:

1. Can the RETI collaborative model (Fig. 1, Box 1) be maintained over time to produce biennial plans addressing a 10-year horizon?
2. Is the development of regional coordinated transmission planning (Fig. 1, Box 2) readily achievable, in what time frame?
3. Will IOUs and POU's effectively integrate RETI plans (Fig. 1, Box 2)?
4. Would using the Strategic Transmission Investment Plan (STIP) process to confirm utility coordination and RETI integration be effective (Fig. 1, Box 3)? If so, how?
5. Would the CAISO and POU balancing authorities integrate STIP recommendations in their annual transmission planning process (Fig. 1, Box 4)? If so, how?
6. Timing: Can a biennial RETI plan and STIP proceeding mesh with annual transmission planning at the CAISO, IOUs, and POU balancing authorities?
7. Would an ultra- long term statewide abstract transmission planning process (see Fig. 2), building on 10-year RETI plans, and looking 20 years beyond the RETI horizon, be desirable and constructive?
 - a. Beneficial to subsequent RETI cycles?
 - b. Beneficial for utility planning?
 - c. Beneficial for corridor designation?
8. What would be the objective, including scope, and content, of an ultra-long term "abstract plan"?

Panelists

- a. Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (Dave Olsen) - confirmed
- b. California Municipal Utilities Association (Tony Braun) - confirmed
- c. Imperial Irrigation District (Juan Carlos Sandoval) – confirmed
- d. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (TBD)
- e. Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Jim Shetler) - confirmed
- f. Pacific Gas &Electric (Jon Eric Thalman) - confirmed
- g. Southern California Edison (Patricia Arons) - invited
- h. California Independent System Operator (Karen Edson) - invited

- i. California Public Utilities Commission (Nancy Ryan) - confirmed
- j. California Energy Commission (Grace Anderson) - confirmed

Invited Stakeholders to Provide Feedback Directed to Panelists

- a. Arthur Haubenstock (BrightSource Energy) - invited
- b. Dariush Shirmohammadi (Transmission Advisor for the California Wind Energy Association) - invited
- c. Environmental representative - TBD

Lunch Break (approx. 12 noon – 1:00 p.m.)

1:00 Continuation of Transmission Planning Panel Discussion (as needed)
(Moderator: Chuck Najarian)

2:00 Staff Proposed Transmission Corridor Designation Selection Methodology
Roger Johnson, Engineering and Corridor Designation Office

Questions for all interested parties

1. What changes should staff make to improve its proposed methodology for selecting RETI transmission line segments for corridor designation?
2. What is the earliest on-line service date for a RETI transmission line segment that should be assumed to consider the segment a candidate for corridor designation?
3. Is on-line date slippage a factor that should be considered in staff's methodology, and if so, how should it be considered?
4. Should transmission line segments identified by the RETI process that are included in the 2009 Strategic Transmission Investment Plan be considered in conformance with the Plan for purposes of a corridor designation need determination?
5. Under what circumstances do you believe that designating a corridor ahead of time could shorten and improve the overall transmission line permitting process and outcome?
6. If the Energy Commission identifies in the 2009 STIP a certain RETI transmission line segment as a candidate for corridor designation, should the transmission line owner prepare and submit an application for a corridor designation?

7. If the answer to the question above is no, what would be the reasons for not applying for a corridor designation?

Public Comments

Adjourn